CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 10. JANUARY, 1917. Vol. VI.

IN MEMORIAM.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE.

On Christmas Eve a fine old Broad Churchman, the Hon. and Very Rev. W. H. Fremantle, late Dean of Ripon, and formerly Fellow, Tutor, and Chaplain of Balliol, and Chaplain to Archbishop Tait, passed away in his eighty-sixth year. Endowed with a fine physique, a strong intellect, ample means, and every educational and social advantage, he devoted himself with whole-hearted and unremitting industry to the service of the Church of England. His view of that Church and of its duty knew no ecclesiastical limitations. For him the Church and the nation were one. The State was the nation organized for civic purposes; the Church the nation organized for religious instruction and worship. Both Church and State had the same object, the national welfare, based securely only on true righteousness. The separation of Church and State, either in thought and feeling or in action, was for him the most deadly heresy and the most ruinous policy. He felt that the weakness of Anglo-Catholicism was its ecclesiasticism. It appeared to him that it wished to separate the ideal of the Church and State, and in a mediaeval Hildebrandine spirit to organize the Church in isolation from the national life and in proud opposition to it. He felt that the weakness of Evangelicalism lay in its individualism, that it limited its activities and outlook too much to the saving of the individual soul, and failed to extend them definitely to the saving of the nation by deliberately claiming every aspect of the national life, political, industrial, and social, as within the sphere of the Christian Religion. Yet, in his personal religious habits and liturgical manners, Dr. Fremantle was closely akin to the

Evangelicals. Yet, in other matters, he was unable to accept the Evangelical ideal. He felt that the Evangelical ideal was good as far as it went, but that it was a *defective* ideal, whereas the ideal of the Anglo-Catholic appeared to him to be a *perverted* ideal.

Very few understood, and possibly still fewer appreciated, his own ideal of the National Church, although he claimed, and with strong arguments, that it was the ideal of the great English Reformers.

His interest in the wider aspects of the Christian Religion was probably first aroused by his successful competition when at Oxford for the Chancellor's English Essay Prize on "The Influence of Commerce upon Christianity," a subject on which there is much more to be said than on the influence of Christianity upon Commerce. But the formative influences in his Broad Churchmanship were undoubtedly Benjamin Jowett, the head of his college, and Dean Stanley, who was Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History when Mr. Fremantle, as Fellow of All Souls', went up the second time to Oxford.

As Bampton Lecturer in 1883 he put into full and formal shape his conception of the function of the Christian Religion in human life. These lectures, entitled *The World as the subject of Redemption*, were almost unnoticed in England, and secured their first public, as did the writings of Jeremy Bentham and Thomas Carlyle, in the United States, where he afterwards accepted an invitation to lecture.

Before this, he had in conjunction with Mr. Brodrick, produced a book on the *Ecclesiastical Judgments of the Privy Council*, which he regarded as affording striking examples of a spirit of wisdom and justice such as could not be looked for in any purely ecclesiastical court.

After the publication of his Bampton Lectures, he wrote a life of St. Jerome—a saint with whom he had little in common except industry—and edited some of his more important writings. Later on he edited two volumes of Jowett's sermons, with an interesting preface dealing with Jowett as a preacher.

He had already published some of his own sermons under the title, *The Gospel of the Secular Life*, and other slighter volumes from his pen appeared in later years. Meanwhile, as successively Vicar of Lewknor, Rector of St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, Canon of Canterbury, and finally Dean of Ripon, he led the life of an active pastor and preacher. His philanthropic and religious activities were many-sided. He organised local charities; he kept in close touch with leading Liberal Protestants on the Continent; he was always striving directly and indirectly to promote better relations between the Church of England and Nonconformists; in Convocation and the *Times* he was ever ready to challenge M. Gambetta's enemy and his own. This led him to view the Church Finance Scheme with grave suspicion as putting a power into the hands of ecclesiastical boards, which he feared might be misused in the interests of clericalism.

In 1902, he read before the Churchmen's Union a paper which, being briefly reported and in a somewhat sensational manner in the daily press, produced a storm in ecclesiastical circles. Dr. Fremantle was accused of having denied Christ's Resurrection and Virgin-birth. What he did deny was not Christ's Resurrection, but the resurrection of His physical body; as for the Virgin-birth, he believed it to have occurred, but did not believe it to be miraculous, regarding it apparently as a case of *parthenogenesis* in the human species, a conclusion which seems to raise more difficulties than it solves.

During his twenty years as Dean of Ripon, he won the respect and affection of his fellow-townsmen by his kind heart, wide sympathy, wise philanthropy, unflinching attention to duty, and generous hospitality.

His life abounded with interesting experiences. He preached at the Hague on the occasion of the Second Peace Conference. Curiously enough it fell to his lot to advise Dr. Tait not to accept Walter Pater as a candidate for Holy Orders, an incident which indicates that the broadest of Broad Churchmen have their limits.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

An Aftermath of the National Mission.

As an aftermath of the National Mission, the Archbishops have appointed five Committees of Enquiry to consider and report upon the following subjects:—

(1) Methods by which the teaching office of the Church can be more effectively exercised.

(2) Ways in which the public worship of the Church can be more directly related to the felt needs of actual life at the present time.

(3) Facts and lessons which the experience of the National Mission has brought to light as to the evangelistic work of the Church at home and abroad, and the best methods of improving and extending it.

(4) The existing administrative system of the Church, including patronage and endowments.

(5) Ways in which the Church may best commend the teaching of Christ to those who are seeking to solve the problems of industrial life.

Although it is agreed on all hands, that the National Mission has failed to touch the nation at large, yet if it be a factor in awakening the bulk of the clergy to the urgent need of many too long delayed Church Reforms, it will have served a useful purpose.

The terms of reference of the different committees leave a very large latitude to their members, but we trust this will not mean that the committees will be tempted to evade such burning questions as interchange of pulpits with Nonconformists, the creation of parish councils with legal powers, reforms in the training and examination of ordinands, the ministry of women, and the simplification of our dogmatic formularies and some modification in their use.

The Decline of Clerical Professionalism.

A recent writer to the *Times* notes with approval an effort on the part of the clergy connected with the National Mission to discard professionalism as far as possible. He thinks that the

professionalism of the clergy is one reason why they have failed to interest the laity in religion.

> "It may seem a minor fault. If a man is good and hardworking one may say it ought not to matter that he is too professional. But it matters as much in the case of the priest as of the artist. For the priest ought to have something of the artist in him. Religion has to do with realities, the greatest of all realities; and it must become unreal to the man who always talks about it in a professional jargon. For his very thought will be infected by that jargon. He will say that he has given a matter his prayerful consideration when he has done nothing of the kind. He will say that he has prayed for guidance when he has really only prayed after a formula that will permit him to do what he likes. There are a great many laymen, men rather religious than irreligious by nature, who, when a clergyman uses phrases such as these, cease at once to listen to him, and look politely at the ceiling. Indeed, it is impossible to listen really to a sermon preached in professional jargon, not merely because the jargon is too familiar, but because it does actually lack meaning.
>
> "Every profession has its own professionalism, and the clergy, being the most separate of all professions, naturally have theirs. But what is merely irritating in a lawyer is fatal in a clergyman; and they are beginning to see this. A generation ago the clergy would probably have said that it was merely wicked in the laity to be put off by professionalism. Now they will not say that, for they are beginning to see that professionalism is itself an irreligious thing, as irreligious as the ecclesiastical art of commerce. Religion is in its nature eager, clear, passionate and beautiful; professionalism is the opposite of all these. It comes from the effort of an imperfect human being to put a shop finish on himself; or perhaps the shop finish has been put upon him unawares by a theological college. At any rate human beings are spoilt by a shop finish even more than works of art; and the clergyman's shop finish is a complete non-conductor between him and the laity."

This incisive condemnation of clerical professionalism has a serious bearing on the training of ordinands. Where it is possible to recognise by a clergymen's intonation, manner, phraseology, and other professional characteristics even the theological college in which he has been trained, the *Times'* correspondent has reasonable cause for complaint, and the theological college authorities will do well to take his criticisms to heart. But it is no easy matter to escape having a professional manner. A clergyman who detested clericalism, and prided himself upon being altogether unprofessional, was yet to his surprise and disgust recognised as a cleric by a stranger with whom he was talking in the hottest chamber of a Turkish bath.

The clergyman wore no clerical collar. He discussed current topics in a mundane manner. It was the studied clearness of his articulation which betrayed him.

Christian Fellowship.

On Sunday evening, December 10th, the Rev. J. Gamble, President of the Bristol Branch of the Churchmen's Union, gave an address on "Our Common Salvation" in the Highbury Congregational Church, Bristol, by the invitation of the minister the Rev. Dr. Arnold Thomas. A large congregation listened to the address, which was reported at length in the Bristol newspapers.

Mr. Gamble, before officiating, received the consent of the Bishop of Bristol and the Bishop of Bath and Wells (in whose diocese Mr. Gamble's parish is situated).

Dr. Arnold Thomas had himself most courteously inquired whether the Bishops would raise any objection to such an invitation being given, and accepted. And the Bishops replied that they would raise no difficulty, provided:—

1. That the incumbent of the parish in which Highbury is situated, raised no objection.
2. That Mr. Gamble gave the lecture at a time which did not clash with the hour of evening service in the parish of that incumbent.
3. That it was a lecture additional to the ordinary service at Highbury, and that Mr. Gamble came there after the ordinary service had concluded.

The distinction between an "address" or "lecture" and a "sermon" may seem to be rather a fine one. But if such a verbal distinction, together with the conditions which the Bishops laid down, should make the way easier elsewhere for such acts of Christian fellowship, it may well be used in the service of so good a cause.

The thanks of liberal Churchmen are due to Dr. Arnold Thomas for his very friendly invitation, and to Mr. Gamble for his readiness to accept it; and, last but not least, to the two Bishops who let it be known that Mr. Gamble accepted the invitation with their approval and good-will.

A Demand for New Hymns.

The *Canadian Churchman* publishes the following story under the head of "A Welcome Rebuke"—

"A well-known man in the United States is Colonel Halford, who was Secretary, years ago, to President Harrison. He has been speaking during the recent campaign of the Laymen's Missionary Movement, and on one occasion, when he was to address a large meeting, the leader, knowing the Colonel to be a life-long Methodist, thought it would be profitable to create a surcharged Methodist atmosphere with some rousing songs before the distinguished visitor began to speak. Evidently he could not have known the precise tone of Colonel Halford's religion. When the time came, the Chairman said: 'Now let us sing, just specially to welcome Colonel Halford, *The Old-time Religion*.' So the young folks began:—

'It's the old-time religion,
It's the old-time religion,
It's the old-time religion,
And it's good enough for me.'

And they followed it through a very long number of verses, such as can be found in one of the Hymn Books, singing that this old-time religion was good enough for father, for mother, and for a score or more of ancient people. Then Colonel Halford was introduced, and after thanking the young people for this wonderful welcome, he added: 'There is one respect in which your singing has come short; there is really another verse which ought to be added to the hymn, and I hope in singing it hereafter you will never omit it. That final verse runs in this way:—

'This is neither sense nor music,
This is neither sense nor music,
This is neither sense nor music,
But it's good enough for me.'

Our Anglican hymnologists do not appear to have incorporated this jewel of hymnody into their miscellaneous and bulky collections. We imagine that its literary quality rather than its sentiments have failed to gain it admission. The need for new hymns capable of expressing the feelings and thoughts of modern Christians with the felicity and majesty with which ancient hymns voiced the religious aspirations of the past, is become steadily greater. The *Scottish Chronicle* for Dec. 29th contains an earnest appeal by the Rev. C. M. Black for a new hymn-writer. He writes, and Liberal clergymen who minister to congregations who have no historical or ecclesiological interest in the hymns they sing, but only desire that

they shall express their deepest feelings, will feel the force of his remarks:—

"We need a new poet who can give us inspiring Advent hymns. Many of these in our hymn-book are frankly impossible, dismal, depressing, crude as theology, and bad as poetry.

"The fact of the matter is that many of these hymns were written by people whose ideas of Jewish eschatology and of human nature were fundamentally wrong. Strange language and curious fantastic pictures describing 'a crisis,' 'a day of judgment,' 'the end of an age,' were taken as portraying the end of the material world. Hence these lurid and unreal hymns. And their ideas of anthropology, physical and ethical, were also all wrong. This error was continued until quite lately, and affected the whole science of education. Man was supposed to be naturally and essentially bad, hence nature, and especially human nature, was suspect. The schoolmaster's business was to assume his pupil to be bad. Now we assume that human nature is fundamentally good, and therefore in education we appeal to what is best in the child.

"So the whole conception of wrong-doing and punishment has essentially changed. Our chief aim in inflicting pain is remedial and beneficent. And this change is reflected in our thoughts about God and His education of us, His children. Hence these morbid hymns are not only depressing, they are morally degrading.

"And so I repeat, one of our greatest needs for a healthy religion is that we should have Advent and other hymns that strike a strong, wholesome, virile note.

"I am not unconscious of the risks and dangers I run through my temerity. I am quite prepared to find the usual pack of traditionalists in full cry at my heels, and I know they will do their best to tear me to pieces, and enjoy the mouthfuls. But in these deathful days it does not matter much how or where a man dies, so long as he dies fighting for the Church's and the world's reformation."

The Spirit of Catholicism.

The new President of the Board of Education emphasizes in the January *Hibbert Journal* the distinction between the spirit of Catholicism, which is "a spirit of submission to the local pieties, inherited instincts and particularising forces of history," and the doctrine of Catholicism which is cosmopolitan. Whether Mr. Fisher's definitions or descriptions of the spirit of Catholicism, or of the doctrine of Catholicism be accepted as either accurate or adequate matters little; but the distinction which he makes between the spirit of Catholicism and the

doctrine of Catholicism matters much. It seems to us to be one of those distinctions which solves problems and clears up difficulties. It is a common belief in educated Christian circles that in the near future there will be a great revival of Catholicism. There are signs of it. France is pointed to in particular as furnishing an example of this revival of Catholicism. Dr. Newman Smyth, an American Nonconformist divine, published a few years ago a book entitled, *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, and there is more in the present situation to justify his words to-day than when his book appeared.

On the other hand, there are many indications that the Roman dogmatic formularies are less and less acceptable to the modern educated man. If this be so, how can there be a revival of Catholicism? Mr. Fisher's distinction supplies the answer. There may be a revival of the Catholic spirit, but without a revival of the Catholic dogma. But can this be? Are not the two so closely intertwined that separation and life apart are impossible? A careful analysis will shew that they are separable, and historical examples will suggest that the spirit of Catholicism can exist without the Roman dogmas. The spirit of Catholicism is the warm, devout, social spirit of religion. It reveres the ancient pieties and the ancestral moralities. It breathes in M. T. Cicero and in Vergil as strongly as in S. Paulinus of Nola or M. Déroulède. It has no definite or necessary connection with the Roman dogma. Walter Pater's Marius, the Epicurean, shared the Catholic spirit when, as a youth, he conscientiously celebrated his ancestral rites. He lost it for a while in the swirl of the great Roman world to behold it again, this time reflected, in the religious beauty of primitive Christian family life.

When Rudolf Sohm writes: "Now the natural man is a born Catholic," he is really saying—although it is not by any means clear that he would accept this interpretation—"Man is naturally a possessor of this warm, devout, social spirit of religion, a spirit which manifests itself in sacramental worship

and reverence for social custom." This spirit of Catholicism Sohm regards as hostile to the Spirit of Christ. It may be so; there are times when it has been so; but it need not be so. The Spirit of Christ can baptize it, and has done so on many occasions.

To understand this is a matter of great difficulty to the extreme Liberal Protestant. For him Catholicism means the idolatrous and superstitious spirit of primitive heathenism united to the historically false and philosophically incredible dogmas of Romanism. But if he could imagine the spirit of Catholicism separated from the Roman dogmas, and then that spirit itself purified and illumined by the Spirit of Christ, it would be possible for him to conceive of the revival of Catholicism, in the sense of a revival of the spirit of Catholicism, without any necessary revival of Romanism.

A most interesting example of a revival of the spirit of Catholicism is to be found in the Free Catholic Movement in this country. It is mainly Nonconformist. The leading spirit of the movement is the Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas, Minister of the Old Meeting Church, Birmingham, and editor of the *Free Catholic*, which is now in its second year. We hope to deal with some aspects of this movement on another occasion.

The Problem of Religion in the Schools.

Dr. W. F. Cobb has a thoughtful article in the January supplement of the *Journal of Education* dealing with the teaching of religion in the schools of the nation. He reminds his readers that the real difficulty is: Who is to teach religion, and how? His answer to these questions is that the teachers must be religious, but that they must teach religion indirectly. He writes:—

> "To foster the love of the ideal is but another name for religious education. And this is better done indirectly. Not what is taught but what is taken for granted is what makes the deepest impression on the pupil's mind. And among the things taken for granted in the teacher none is so likely to be fruitful as a hidden passion for the good in one of

its many forms, provided that this be never intruded but never absent, and be left unfettered by creed or code or department."

But what does Dr. Cobb mean by a religious teacher? He means one who has a "sane philosophy" that inspires its possessor with a vital love of truth, beauty, and goodness. He expands his view thus:—

"That God is and that God is good are pretty nearly all that Plato taught about religion. To this we add that man is God's prophet; that the distinctive spirit of humanity is the highest embodiment of the Divine that we can know; that 'fairer than life or than youth, is this, to die for the truth;' that liberty is the light of the spirit of man; that evil is to be hated and fought; that good is to be loved and died for; that life and not death is at the heart of things; that we were so made that joy should take the sting out of pain; and that courage, sympathy, humanity, and justice form the hall-mark of all religion that is real. It ought not to be impossible for such a philosophy to be given to teachers as their guide and inspirer to give life and feeling even to a lesson in arithmetic. Then they might be left to press home this broad and deep theology by illustrations drawn from the history of man, his struggles, his sorrows, and his conquests, from the lives of 'men, the masters of things,' from poet and psalmist and sage, from Nature and from human life. But to do this it is essential that such a theology be not imposed as a dogma or code on either teachers or children, but used as an inspiration to the teacher, that, being first touched himself by the finger of the ideal, he may then be enabled to lift up his pupils from the narrow and the sordid to what is great and beautiful."

Dr. Cobb recognises as do all practical educationists the need for religion in national education, but he does not recognise any need for the teaching of theology to children. He does not regard theology or, in other words, the philosophy of religion as a suitable intellectual food for children. In any case there is no practical prospect of Christian theology being taught as part of our national system of education, the contending protagonists of rival Christian theologies in England have made that impossible.

But if religion is to be taught without theology, it is needful that the educationists should aim definitely at purifying and strengthening the religious spirit. Hence the religious test in the case of the teacher is not assent to the articles of a creed, but the possession of this religious spirit, and the only sure proof of the possession of that is found in character and conduct.

We venture to think that the Rev. W. Temple in his controversy in *The Highway* with Mr. Graham Wallas would do better to take his stand on this position, that no verbal affirmation of religious belief must be required from any teacher as a test of his suitability to teach children. As Mr. Temple justly remarks:—

> "The only religion worth having is one that colours and governs the whole of life and thought."

But you can no more get some of the best men to assent definitely to a dogmatic belief in God, although they would die a martyr's death rather than deny God, than Lear could get Cordelia to profess filial affection and loyalty. Yet, in not a few cases, these are the natures which exercise the deepest and most lasting religious influence over their fellows, and especially over boys and young men. Any religious test which does not admit them is defective, yet there is no ecclesiastical test which would not exclude them.

A Trumpet Call to the Church.

The latest number of the *Trinity University Review* of Toronto publishes a forcible article on "The Church's Task in the New World after the War," by Dr. W. F. Clark. The utterance is worthy of a bishop; we fear Dr. Clark will regard this as a doubtful compliment. However, we shew our sincerity by re-publishing the greater part of his excellent paper. We have often wished that, following the precedents of the fourth century—one of the greatest of the ages of the Church—the Church of England would consecrate laymen *per saltum* to the episcopate. We might hope to "get a move on" if laymen of Dr. Clarke's type sat on our episcopal thrones.

1.—How can the Church best adapt herself to the new conditions which are arising?

To an ordinary layman like myself the most urgent need to-day is for the Church to give out a clear statement of the Gospel which Christ taught and lived—the Gospel which produced our creeds and turned the world upside down. You bishops and clergy, who are the official voice of the Church, make up your minds and then tell us plainly what

you believe to be the meaning of life. Be candid with us, do not hide yourselves behind the Church or the Fathers, or the literal text of the Bible. We have our suspicions that often you are attempting to teach something you are supposed to teach and we to believe, something which has lost its reality for yourselves as well as for us. Make up your minds what is the living Truth which has given you new life, joy, and freedom, and then communicate this to the world. But the clergy do not give us the impression that this sense of a burning light within, of an over-flowing life, is a common one with them; and then comes the difficulty of how to communicate a living experience to others. Sermons alone cannot do it, no dogmatic forcing pump, no mechanical arrangements no matter how venerable, can do it. Personal contact, such as the early disciples had with our Lord, seems necessary, a combination of teaching and living found so effective in the mission field. In all other branches of learning the idea of set lectures of a dogmatic nature being of any great value as a means of education has been given up long ago, and for the sake of teachers and those taught, classes where questions may be asked and the thoughts of many hearts revealed, have been substituted in their place. Religion is a matter of education and not of cramming. There is a religious instinct in us seeking guidance, expression, and education. Sermons for the masses, men, women, and children in a lump, by inspired or uninspired clergy, do not satisfy this want. Sunday School instruction by amateur teachers who have not the ghost of a notion what religion means, does not do it.

To an ordinary man of the world it appears that at present a kindergarten symbolic religion is taught in the schools with no attempt to explain the symbolism, or even to suggest that the symbols are symbols and not intended to be taken as matters of fact—the teachers being literalists themselves—and then the Church is afraid to teach serious religion to the adult product of these Sunday schools for fear of upsetting their precious, simple, materialistic belief. Can you wonder that the Church continually bewails the loss of her grown boys and girls? It is largely to their credit that they fail to find satisfaction for their religious instincts in the Church.

The grown boys and girls of to-day are superficially familiar with modern scientific and religious thought. It is served up to them in daily, weekly, and monthly papers, and, as the Church is incapable of guiding the healthy fermentation set up in their minds, but can only seek to repress it, they feel themselves suspected, unorthodox and cut off from her sympathy, and so leave her.

To deal with this problem would I am afraid mean a revolution in our theological colleges. Men would be ordained to service for their spiritual power and their knowledge of the wideness of God's mercy rather than for their ability to pass examinations and produce certificates of moral rectitude.

Let us then devote more attention to learning and to teaching the foundations of religion and the meaning of human life, and less to the attempt to express in public worship a religion which is not there.

2.—Modification of Church Services.

This is a matter for gradual evolution after the real condition of things has been grasped. To an ordinary uninstructed person the services of the Church are unintelligible. In your sermons you assume that the congregations you address are Christian when, as a matter of fact, they are, for the most part, ignorantly heathen and have no notion of the meaning of many of the terms you use. It is not so much a question of altering the services to suit the people as of educating the people to understand the meaning of religion and worship; and for that purpose it might be well to turn the Sunday evening services into classes for adults where the problems of life could be freely discussed, and the light of Christian truth brought to bear upon them.

3.—The Church and Social Service.

As the Church and Society are, or rather perhaps should be, largely the same people organized for different purposes, this question resolves itself into one of how should the Church prepare its members for their work in Society—their work in the world? This surely when it is looked upon in the light of our Lord's teaching and life is the most important question with which the Church, in these, or indeed any times, has to deal.

The Christian cannot divide his life into compartments. His religion will be manifested in his works in the world, and his works in the world will manifest his religion however much he may deceive his neighbours and himself by his outward religious activities. There is only one way we have of serving God here and now—and that is by serving our fellow-men. There is only one way to learn what love to God, whom we have not seen, means, and manifest it here, and that is by loving his children, the men and women whom we have seen.

Why is the influence of the Church so feeble and ineffectual in social affairs? It has allowed itself to become dominated by the world (in its bad sense) and has built up a large and expensive plant dependent upon the rich and the powerful, and so sold itself to Mammon.

Some time ago the Patriarch of the Serbian Church speaking in London to a meeting of Anglican Churchmen contrasting eastern pessimism with western optimism said: "To us in the East the Prince of this world looks much stronger than to you." This, however it was meant, was no compliment to us. Our optimism is the optimism of a superficial view of life, a matter of being on comfortable terms with the world and its prince, not of a profound faith in the ultimate triumph of the power and the love of God. Surely this war will teach us something of the power of the world and the devil, and that not alone in Germany.

Let the Church awake to the evils of free competition where every man is rewarded according to his power to exploit his fellowman, and the needy are robbed all the time. Let her boldly denounce our present industrial system and throw in her lot with those who are seeking to evolve a more human, and so more Christian, system and she will do much to recover her spiritual power with the mass of the people.

4.—Intellectual Problems.

There is a real need if not for a re-statement of the faith at least for a new explanation of the creeds. It should be made plain that the creeds are the goal and not the starting points of our religion. They are largely the records of the past spiritual experience of Christian men, and have crystallised out of that experience.

The stress should be placed upon the acceptance of Christ's revelation of the meaning of life and the necessity of our striving to live according to that revelation, and then we shall find the creeds will become illuminated and become the natural symbols of our faith. "Whosoever willeth to do my will shall know of the Doctrine."

5.—Co-operation with other Religious Bodies.

We have in the past by our superior theory of Apostolic Succession cut ourselves off from our fellow Christians and made it hard for them to work comfortably with us. No one likes a superior person. Now as the theory is seen to be rather a heathen and materialistic idea limiting God's action and is breaking down (few outside the body of the clergy, even amongst our own really believe it) would it not greatly aid in the strength of our position, as part of the ancient historic Church, and make our Church the rallying centre of Christian action in this country if the theory were frankly abandoned?

The manifestation of Christian power is the only thing which will "draw all men unto us," and this power can only be manifested by the members of our Church co-operating with everybody or anybody who is furthering the Kingdom of Heaven and hastening the manifestation of the Son of God.

A Final Warning.

A Church without works is dead, and a society without a knowledge of God and of the underlying unity of life is devoid of the spring of real progress and is destined to discord and disruption.

A Church incapable of manifesting spiritual power, incapable of guiding the material forces of society, is doomed to disappear, and the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of Life, will manifest itself elsewhere. Beneath all the superficial causes of the war lies the fact that the Churches no longer lead.

We must not deceive ourselves with the idea that German theology has anything to do with the war. Rather must we look for the powerlessness of the Christian message in the fact that national lust for power, and universal lust for personal gain have dictated terms to religion and modified the Message of Christ.

How is the Church to respond to the call of the world after the war? There seems to be little doubt but that if she goes on in her present isolated self-satisfied way, busied with her own internal disorders, like a self-centred hypochondriac, she will be brushed aside as a useless and expensive luxury.

CONDITIONS OF PEACE.

QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE WAR.

The War at every stage keeps on raising the deepest religious and moral questions in their most acute and practical forms. Is there a God? Is He omnipotent? Is He moral? To these questions the faithful Christian still answers: There is a God. He is omnipotent, in the sense that He will finally achieve His creative aim. He is moral; His nature is love, and His creative aim is the highest welfare of His creatures.

The question however, which is becoming more and more acute in Christian circles is this: Is the nature of the Divine love dominantly passive or dominantly active? It is the answer to this question which to-day divides the pacifists from those who urge the prosecution of the War.

The pacifist believes that the Divine Love is shewn supremely in suffering love, and that God refuses to use force and pain to quell evil. Therefore the Christian man should not use them to quell evil. The only godlike attitude in the presence of violence and injustice, is that exemplified by God suffering in Christ on the Cross. He prayed for his persecutors. Hence this must be the Christian attitude in the presence of injustice and violence. Moreover, the pacifist would urge that, besides being the only right attitude, it is the only effective attitude, for it alone achieves the moral reformation of the offender.

A better answer seems to be this: The reformative influence of suffering love is only effective when it is clearly realised by the wrong-doer that the sufferer has absolute power to revenge the wrong inflicted, but refrains from doing so out of love for the wrong-doer, whom he desires to reform by compelling him to realise his love for him. If the wrong-doer suspects that the motive of his victim's passivity is inability through lack of force or lack of spirit to check the infliction of suffering, the passivity of the sufferer will have no moral effect

on the wrong-doer, but, in all probability, an immoral effect. Therefore, until the Allies have demonstrated to Germany their absolute power to crush her, which is very far from being the case at present, they are not in the position to do her any moral good by forgiving her.

Whether the infliction of suffering on her will not do her more moral good than allowing her to inflict suffering without reprisals depends upon our whole view of the reformative character of suffering. Inasmuch as the creative process involves suffering, and suffering does seem very often to produce good results in the case of rational and moral beings who see themselves suffer on account of their irrational or immoral conduct, and are even led to confess finally that conduct which they were unwilling to believe was irrational and immoral before they suffered, has as the result of "the sweet uses of adversity" been seen by them to be irrational and immoral, it may be hoped that Germany herself as the result to her sufferings, especially if they are sufficiently prolonged, will be brought to see the true nature of her conduct. Even of Christ, the sinless One, it was said "He learned obedience by the things which He suffered," and was made "perfect through sufferings."

Another question which the War is asking most insistently to-day is: Ought a Christian to allow forgiveness to exclude reparation, and the undertaking not to offend in the same way again? The answer seems to be that only where the offender freely offers reparation, and willingly undertakes by promises, or if he can give them, guarantees, not to offend in that way again, can his repentance be regarded as sincere. In that case he may be forgiven, and, if the circumstances seem to warrant it, reparation and guarantees of future good conduct need not be exacted. But certainly where they are not sincerely and freely offered, they ought to be enforced as conditions of forgiveness.

Germany plunged into war like a criminal, and she has conducted the War like a criminal, and there can be no possibility of Christian peace or enduring peace until Germany

recognises the true character of her conduct, or at least is prevented from being in a position to repeat it.

Every humane and Christian Englishman desires peace, but the serious question with which he is faced is: Whether that longing for peace is not of the nature of the temptation which assaulted our Lord in Gethsemane? What the Saviour's cup was for Him, the cup of War is for England to-day—suffering needful for the redemption of mankind. If that be so, the only right attitude is one of unflinching and self-sacrificing obedience in the deep faith that the *via crucis* will prove the *via lucis* not simply for ourselves but for the world.

JACOB BOEHME.

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, B.A.

Jacob Boehme, though well known to and highly valued by a somewhat select circle, is a stranger to the majority even of religious people in England.

One reason for his lack of popularity has been the occasional obscurity of his style. Though able to write clearly enough when he chose to use homely language, his taste for the barbarous dialect of contemporary alchemy and astronomy has disfigured his pages. We have to recognise, however, that he had no perfect literary vehicle ready to hand, the language of speculation was yet in its infancy, in his day.

Another reason may be that he seemed to many devout souls to break rather too definitely with some points of Protestant orthodoxy. His was a religion not of authority, but of the Spirit. Nor did Boehme have the support, as the Catholic

mystics have had, of a great institution, which has generally known well how to make the best use of its own pietists.[1]

Boehme was born in a notable epoch. His was the generation of Kepler, Galileo, and Francis Bacon. While he was yet an infant, Giordano Bruno was already fleeing from the Inquisition at Venice, to be at last consumed in its flames.

In these days, the division of intellectual labour had not been carried far. One and the same man might combine a pretention to science, to philosophy, to theology, to law, and perhaps to art. Boehme's interests were primarily religious, and it was the demands of his religious consciousness which he was seeking to satisfy when he applied himself to science and metaphysics. Yet as a metaphysician he takes high rank.

> "He stated his own problems, and treated them with an intellectual force and freedom which has made his work valuable even now."

This is the verdict of Professor Höffding, who in his *History of Modern Philosophy* devotes to Boehme half the space that he allots to Hegel.

Boehme was not a professional philosopher or religious teacher. A shoemaker by trade, he was yet one of those who are driven irresistibly into speculation, and his solution of the religious problem cost him many struggles. When the light at last shone, it seemed to him as though "life had pierced into the heart of death." In 1612 (aet. 37) his first work was sent forth to circulate in manuscript among his friends. *Die Morgenröte* was the appropriate title, for the dawn seemed to him now breaking. A copy of the work came into the hands of the orthodox pastor of Görlitz, and he managed to procure a prohibition against further publications. For five years the rescript was endorsed by the authorities or respected by the heretic, but after this, the torrent could not be restrained, and for the rest of his life Boehme's pen was never idle. Before his death in 1624 he had published over thirty dissertations, long and short.

[1] Molinos, it is true, ended his days in a dungeon, and Madame Guyon found herself in prison, but this is now recognised to have been due to an excessive and undiplomatic zeal on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities.

The problems that had tortured Boehme were two: the existence of evil, and the insignificance of man in face of the immensity of the universe. The latter problem had been aggravated, if not created, by the discoveries of Copernicus, upsetting as they did the familiar cosmogony assumed throughout the Bible.

For the second problem, that occasioned by the new remoteness of God, a solution was sought by Boehme along the lines laid down by Bruno, who had declared that the Deity is "in a closer relation to us than that in which we stand to ourselves," God being the soul of our soul, as He is the soul of the whole of nature.

In his work, *Signatura Rerum*,[1] Boehme lays down in somewhat obscure language his cosmology:—

> "God," he proclaims, "dwells in all things . . . . everything receives power from him" (S.R. viii. 44).

And yet he disclaims pantheism:—

> "I do not say that nature is God . . . . but I say God gives power to every life" (S.R. viii. 42).

In all things, then, God dwells:—

> "Creation is an instrument of the Eternal Spirit with which He melodises . . . . and as an organ of divers and various sounds or notes is moved with one only air . . . . thus there is only one spirit in the whole work of divine manifestation" (S.R. xvi. 3, 4).

But though ubiquitously indwelling, this Spirit is not everywhere felt, some organ-pipes are unconscious of the air that melodises upon them—"the *thing* knows nothing of God." But "angels and men" are as "a spoken word" expressing "the eternal knowledge of the eternal mind." They are, as it were, "portraits of Himself painted by God" (S.R. x. 43, 44), and man's high destiny is to be "God's melodious instrument in his love" (x. 48). "We are all strings in his joyful concert."

For Boehme, then, as for the author of the *Hymn of Cleanthes* and the *Gospel according to St. John*, God was not "far off." Copernicus might have destroyed the familiar universe where man felt so much at home, and (as it seemed)

[1] The *Signature of all Things*, together with the *Supersensual Life*, has been published in the *Everyman Library*.

have left God no heaven to be His throne, yet—as Pascal saw—man is greater than the stars, and his heart may be a dwelling place of the Eternal.

But the second problem remains—the origin of evil. Boehme offered a solution along lines that have become familiar. Nature, we remember, was for him, a manifestation of the Eternal. But it is only possible for nature to become manifest through "contrariety and combat." Without combat, "there were no nature, but an eternal stillness," but in the combat nature becomes manifest (S.R. ii. 4).

But behind the struggling contrarieties, is the same power of the Eternal,—

> "God gives power to every life, be it good or bad . . . . for He himself is All."

Boehme does not make it very clear—perhaps his own mind was not decided—whether corresponding to the cleavage and struggle in manifest creation, there exists a dual principle in the hidden nature of God. He speaks of the two contrary elements in Him—love and wrath; and yet he writes definitely enough:—

> "The great mystery in itself is only *one* thing, but in its explication and manifestation it goes . . . . into two essences, *viz.*, into evil and good."

It will be admitted that Boehme was a vigorous and original metaphysician; but his religious genius is equally outstanding. Indeed, as we have pointed out, his speculations were prompted by the demands of his religious consciousness, and subordinate to them. It was the felt need of personal salvation that drew him to seek a way of deliverance. For him, philosophy was a preliminary step; enlightenment was a means, not an end.

It will not have been forgotten that in Boehme's view, though creation was a manifestation of the eternal Being, yet it was "angels and men" alone who were conscious of the presence of the Divine. It was in this conscious union between man and God that salvation, for Boehme, consisted. And the one barrier that prevents this union is the individual and selfish will.

"How can I hear Him speak?" asks the disciple of His master in *The Supersensual Life*, and the answer is:—

> "When thou standest still from the thinking of self and the willing of self . . . so God speaketh in thee, and whispereth to thy spirit, and thy spirit heareth His voice."

A man's own willing, hearing, and seeing, are:—

> "Thy own dark prison which thou makest for thyself."

This evil principle against which a perpetual battle is to be fought, Boehme calls "egoity," and it can only be overcome by that power which "enlarges the soul as wide as the whole creation of God"—the power of love.

> "Whosoever finds it finds all things."

Where the fire of love is kindled, it burns down the partition between the soul and God.

> "If [love] but once kindle a fire within thee, thou shalt then certainly feel how it consumeth all that which it toucheth; thou shalt feel it in the burning up of thyself, and swiftly devouring all egoity, or that which thou callest I and Me, as standing in a separate root, and divided, from the Deity, the fountain of thy being."[1]

By a change of figure, Boehme speaks also of the death of self leaving room in the soul for God.

> "Where the love of self is banished, there dwelleth the love of God. For so much of the soul's own will as is dead unto itself, even so much room hath the will of God, which is His love, taken up in that soul."

The road of self-surrender, the only avenue to salvation recognised by Boehme, is a hard one. The crowd will always prefer the easy path of religious emotionalism, or the frequented ways of Catholic or Protestant formalism. For these by-roads of religion, Boehme's scheme can find no place: "titular and verbal Christians" is his appellation for those that walk thereon. In his view, it is not a scheme of theology but a process of life that is the saving power. Men must be born again.

> "All fictions and devices which men contrive to come to God by are lost labour and vain endeavour *without a new mind*. Verbal forgiveness and outward imputation of righteousness are false and vain

[1] *Of the Supersensual Life.* Dialogue ii.

comforts—soft cushions for the evil soul—without the creation of a will wholly new, which loveth and willeth evil no more."[1]

Not that Boehme pretends to dispense with the grace of God. "Without Me ye can do nothing" he reminds us, thus echoing the conviction of the noblest and most devout minds of history.

"There is nothing more required of thee at first, than not to resist His grace,"

are the encouraging words he uses.

"My grace is sufficient for thee,"

is his gospel.

To the remarks we have already made, it only remains to add that Boehme seems to have struck his contemporaries as a personality of singular charm. His friend and biographer, Abraham von Franckenberg, says of him:—

"He was gentle in manner, modest in his words, humble in conduct, patient in suffering, and meek of heart."

Save for his eyes, which were, we are told,

"Grey and rather of an azure cast, lighting up like the windows of Solomon's Temple,"

he seems to have been of insignificant appearance.

He was "worn and very plain, his stature small, his forehead low, his nose somewhat crooked . . . his beard short and thin, his voice feeble."

And yet he may take high rank on the records of mankind, for as Diderot (who, though a lover of his fellows, was yet no saint), briefly observed:—

"To do what is good, to know what is true . . . that is what distinguishes one man from another; the rest is nothing."

Judged by the criterion of the French atheist, this humble German shoemaker ranks higher than many who have made a more notable figure in the world.

Boehme was, indeed, one of those little ones who, we have good authority for believing, take high place in the kingdom of Heaven.

---

[1] *True Resignation*, 30-41; quoted by Rufus Jones. *Spiritual Reformers of XVI. and XVII. Centuries*, p. 193.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

By Miss E. M. Caillard.

Communion, fellowship, to use a synonym which is equally expressive, is based on something deeper than itself. There must be an underlying community of thought, of desire, of aim (in spite perhaps of superficial diversities which to some extent obscure it), if we are really to be in communion or fellowship with others. And to have community of thought, desire, and aim implies spiritual union in a very high degree.

The extreme closeness of the ties, physical, intellectual, and spiritual, which bind succeeding generations of human beings to one another has been very strikingly and beautifully brought out in the last essay of a recently published book, *Concerning Prayer*, which is probably already well known to many readers. In this essay, whose title is *Prayer for the Dead*, it is pointed out that we have no evidence justifying us in the assumption so frequently made that created spirits will ever be free from the need of "clothing themselves in some material form as a necessary part of their self-expression." We may go further than this if those great tenets of our Christian faith, the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Redemption of the body, are living realities to us. The consecration of the physical, which the first implies, and the capacity for spiritual renewal, which the second implies, are not easily to be reconciled with the notion of any inherent unworthiness of matter as a vessel of the Divine. This would indeed make St. Paul's conception of our bodies as "temples of the Holy Ghost" difficult, if not impossible, to grasp. If, however, we refer material forms to a Divine, and therefore spiritual origin, the closeness of those physical relations which extend throughout the known universe becomes a continued symbol, perhaps we may even say *pledge*, of the spiritual unity underlying them, the unity of the Creative Spirit, of God Himself. They proclaim in their own language the truth revealed to Israel: I, the Lord thy God, am *One*, and which in the Fourth Gospel receives in our Lord's high-priestly prayer such marvellous and illuminating

development. There, indeed, is truly to be found the basis of the Communion of Saints, in the union of our Lord with the Father and of the Father with Him. It was His own petition "that they all may be one; even as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us."[1] And again, "that they may be one, even as we are One." It places the Communion of Saints, made possible by the spiritual union of all faithful souls, on an unshakeable foundation when we see that it is the very Being of God Himself.

In order to communion we need a *medium of communication*, and that between Christian "Saints" is the Spirit-inspired apprehension of the Divine-human Christ. Fundamentally, it is the Spirit Himself; nothing lower, nothing narrower than the Spirit of God Who is Love. But because even the most faithful, the most ardent souls have but partially attained to their "full stature" in Christ and as yet see only "as through a glass darkly," they cannot enter into the complete joy and fruition of that fellowship of the Spirit, the other name for which is the Communion of Saints. The true cause of the divisions among us, of our intolerance of one another, of our narrow and foolish sectarian claims to the unique possession of the purest truth, is simply due to our failure "to apprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that we may be filled unto all the fulness of God."

It is very noticeable that St. Paul lays down as a condition of the apprehension of the love of Christ, that it should be "with all the saints." It is to be a *social*, not merely an individual, experience. We may indeed say that since God is love, and our Lord Jesus Christ is the supreme manifestation of God, love is both the basis and medium of the Communion of Saints. "A new commandment give I unto you, That ye love one another;" a new commandment, a positive precept instead of negative interpretations of the Will of God, beginning with "thou shalt *not*." It is absence of love which foments divisions

[1] John xvii. 21.

in the Christian body, which makes them so difficult to heal, so rancorous in their manifestations. But let us not forget the other side; it is the *presence* of love, the presence of the Divine Spirit, therefore, which fosters and increases the desire for unity, which, even while this is outwardly still absent, enables Christians of different denominations to realize, as thank God many of them do realize, that deeper than anything which separates them is the bond that unites them.

The Communion of *Saints*. It is perhaps worth while to remind ourselves that whatever may be the case in other religions, all Christians are called to be saints. The word is apt to be confined to a special type of holiness, to lives not simply consecrated to God and to the service of others, all Christian lives are by implication that, but to lives set apart from the ordinary walks of men and personally untouched by their interests, peculiarly meriting by their aloofness from so-called secular matters the title religious. The New Testament knows of no such distinction as this. It recognises special *vocations*, and a few among them require that a man should forsake "father and mother and all that he hath" in order to follow Christ in the way to which he individually is called; but to follow Christ is incumbent on all those who bear His name and who would be true disciples, and the true disciples of Christ are the saints.

The Communion of Saints is not simply an article of faith. It is a high privilege and a practical inspiration for daily life in which every aid that can be afforded is so urgently needed if we would indeed be faithful to our Lord. This particular aid is against the numbing and disheartening sense of loneliness which is apt to overwhelm those who by temperament or circumstances would otherwise appear to themselves solitary strivers against the forces of evil, isolated outposts on the battlefield of the Church militant. The cry of Elijah: "And I only even I am left," is familiar enough in moments of discouragement to many Christian hearts. To Elijah it was said "Yet will I leave me seven thousand in Israel which have

not bowed the knee to Baal."[1] To the Christian it is said: "Thou art come unto Mount Zion, unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem . . . to the general assembly and Church of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven, and to the spirits of just men made perfect."[2] If this fact becomes even in a small degree matter of *experience*, can the incapacitating sense of loneliness remain?

It is true, indeed, that even more cheering and inspiring than realization of the Communion of Saints, is that of personal Communion with the Lord of Saints and it may well be that to some specially detached and ardent souls the latter experience swallows up and absorbs the former. But to ordinary Christian men and women, to the "saints" full of infirmity with whom we are in daily contact, of whose company we ourselves are, *both* realizations are needed—that of our union with the Church militant and triumphant, and that of our individual union with Christ. It may be said, indeed, that we cannot adequately realize the latter without the former because no individual can ever be fully himself, can ever rise to the height of the Divine Ideal for him in isolation. He needs the social element in his being to be brought into due prominence, or his manhood will never be fully developed. We are in very truth "members one of another" in all our human relations; most really, and it should be most consciously, in those which are taken up, expanded, intensified, exalted through their consecration in Christ, shown to have their root in God Himself, the Father of Whom every fatherhood in heaven and earth is named.

Our grasp of this truth is sorely weakened and obscured by the unloving conditions in which Christians actually live on earth, and of which the present terrible war is a sinister illustration. We are arrayed against one another in deadly conflict, and though theoretically we should probably assert that this fact does not loosen the spiritual ties which bind us together in Christ, practically it makes them very difficult to

[1] 1 Kings, xix. 18. [2] Heb. xii. 23.

believe in and to act upon. Yet just as some of our wisest thinkers have pointed out that despite opposing and irreconcilable ethical and political aims, it is still possible to us and to our enemies to meet on common ground in intellectual matters, so amongst faithful Christian souls there is a similar spiritual possibility, for to them of whatever nationality they may be, there is "one Lord."

But fellowship with our brothers still on earth, living under the same conditions as ourselves, is only part of what the Communion of Saints involves. There are the vast number of those who have passed through the veil that hides the invisible life from us, who are now taking part in it, yet who, as we may most reasonably suppose, and as the New Testament seems to indicate, are still deeply interested in the life which is ours and which they so lately shared with us. At the present moment earth is pouring in a volume which staggers thought, thousands upon thousands of her most promising, and, as it appears to us, most sorely needed lives into the great Beyond. Can we suppose that these departed have no more interest in that conflict which is rending the world, that they no longer realize how vital it seems to us and did seem to them while they were joining in it? Among them, as among us, there are those to whom even here the greatest war of all the wars that earth has known was an infinitely smaller thing than the age-long conflict between good and evil, between Christ and anti-christ, those who have trembled, as many of us also tremble, at the supernatural glory of genius which is marshalled in, and orders the hosts of evil, as we compare it with the obvious weakness, the faint-heartedness of many of the good.[1] Have they become indifferent? Or is that not a truer conception of their attitude which impelled the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews to set before us as an incentive to tireless courage and undaunted faith, the "great cloud" of invisible witnesses by whom we are surrounded; and opened the ear of the seer in the Apocalypse to hear the cry of the souls "under the altar:"

[1] *Communings of a Day*, pp. 27-28.

"*How long?*" How should the time not seem long to those who have passed before us into the invisible, since they must wait till we have attained our appointed goal before they with us can be made perfect?

If, however, they are represented as still bearing a part with us in long expectation, we, even we now and here, may have through faith a share in their foretaste of triumph. We, too, may join in "the Song of Moses and of the Lamb." We, too, may cry: "Worthy is the Lamb that hath been slain to receive the power, and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honour, and glory, and blessing;"[1] for we know that only through His sacrifice, and in so far as we are empowered in Him to become sacrifices ourselves, is victory attained.

Critical considerations are perhaps apt to make us lose sight of the deep spiritual significance of many of those symbolic pictures given to us in the book of Revelation. Yet from a devotional point of view they bring home to us very vividly the close unity of that "one family in earth and heaven" of which we sing in a familiar hymn. The complete passage from which part has just been quoted is one of the most remarkable of these pictures. We are shown first the "Lamb as it had been slain" (the Lion of the tribe of Judah) standing in the midst of the Throne, receiving the worship of the heavenly hosts. After that we are told: "Every created thing which is in heaven, and on the earth, and on the sea, and all things that are in them, heard I saying: 'Unto Him that sitteth on the Throne, and unto the Lamb be the blessing, and the honour, and the glory, and the dominion for ever and ever.'"[2] With the exception of the often quoted passage in the 8th chapter of the epistle to the Romans, there is no other in all the New Testament which so brings home to us the solidarity of "the whole creation." St. Paul emphasizes the groaning and travailing of the universe with its human representatives, its share in their earnest expectation and hope of being delivered from "the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God." The writer of the Apocalypse emphasizes the

[2] Rev. v. 12. [1] Rev. v. 13.

stupendous volume of adoring worship in which that same creation unites itself with innumerable angels and the whole blessed company of the redeemed. The Communion of Saints seems to include within itself fellowship in suffering and joy with every creature of God. One is reminded of Blake's assertion that when the sun rose he saw not a round, yellow disc, but a multitude of angels crying: "Holy, Holy, Holy."

But though such visions of the participation of Nature in the redemption and glorification of the body may enter into our ideal of the Communion of Saints, its deepest significance to Christians lies in their own share in its privileges and its responsibilities. With regard to the latter, they are most strikingly and most searchingly brought out in the essay to which reference was made at the commencement of this paper, and from which a short quotation follows:—"We believe that here we live and move and have our being in God; we do not question the fact that those who pass into the life beyond also have their being in Him. Yet here our lives are profoundly modified by the good and evil in personalities about us, and by their emotions of joy and sorrow; and every hour the souls of men pass over, and the lives of those to whose company they go must in some like way be affected by their character and condition. Knowing that all we are and do affects our fellows here, we can see that our actions, thoughts, prayers, affecting the social life here, will, through the medium of passing souls, affect the social life beyond."[1] Thus even if there be none but this indirect connexion between us and our own individual beloved who have left their earthly conditions behind, we can help or hinder their further progress in the knowledge and love of God and of their brothers, by helping or hindering the work of the Church on earth of which we are members, and which is one with that Society into which they have entered.

To many persons, however, and amongst them to the writer, it is extremely difficult, even impossible, to believe that there is nothing more than this indirect connexion, though evidence

[1] *Concerning Prayer*, p. 492.

to the contrary is under present conditions rare and in the nature of things is bound to be individual, and consequently only individually convincing. Its rareness is probably chiefly due to our low standard of faith and spiritual apprehension which makes us impervious to penetration by the immaterial. Yet sometimes, sporadically, it is the case that intercommunication does take place without any resort to the artificial and, to say the least, questionable methods of spiritualism; and that to those who deeply desire it and who are content to use no artificial means, but to lay their desire before the Father of spirits in child-like confidence and submission, it may be granted. In any case, His perfect knowledge of and sympathy with all His children, under whatever conditions they may be living, leaves a free path, if only their whole being is kept open to the inspiration of His Divine Spirit, for any comfort or assurance in regard either to the present life or that to come of which they stand in need.

The wall of separation which we look upon as the work of death, is, perhaps, much more truly of our own building; and could we attain to greater realization of the continuity between life on earth and life beyond earth, it may well be that the barrier would appear a very slight one, more like a curtain that could be drawn aside, or a veil that could be lifted, than an impenetrable obstacle. There is one man-made difficulty which is constantly hampering our spiritual progress, but which we seldom think of in the present connexion. It is the hard and fast division which we regard as existing between the sacred and the secular in our earthly life. Certain occupations, for instance are set on the sacred or spiritual, certain others on the secular or material side, and we conceive of the blessed dead as being wholly concerned with the former, whereas we in this life are bound to give ourselves more or less completely to the latter. But if we are spiritual beings, how can such a division be justified save as a concession to our human weakness and its accompanying dimness of vision? It is true indeed that there are *temporal* and there are *eternal* elements in our

experience; the temporal are transitory and changeable, the eternal abide; but the eternal can and do manifest themselves in and through the temporal, the whole value of which lies in its being capable of thus becoming the expression of that which transcends itself. In this case how can any human occupation or calling be thought of as wholly secular or material? The Kingdom of God is a social state, and those who are called, as every Christian is called, to work for its establishment and advancement, are of very diverse capabilities and vocations; the one supreme vocation, the service of God and man, embraces all others. If all creation is His temple, then all our earthly experience is a training, or the commencement of a training, to bear a part in the temple-service, to take our share in the work of transforming earthly conditions into those of the beauty and glory of a house of God "not made with hands," but with the willing heart, the keen intellect, the sympathetic understanding, which are one and all due to the inspiration of the Divine, Creative Spirit.

But if this is the work of the Church on earth, militant until that work is achieved, can we suppose that those who have been members of her, who are still members of the Church universal, divided from their former comrades only by "Jordan's narrow stream," have ceased to take any interest or part in it? It is not possible unless their passage through that stream has obliterated their conscious interest and participation in the work of their Lord ceaselessly carried on for mankind, and this is in truth inconceivable. Why should death, which is a physical episode, interrupt the activities of spirits brought into being after the likeness of their Creator, and who may therefore well be thought capable of finding and using in their changed environment expressions suitable to it and to themselves? The highest privilege of men and women on earth is to be "workers together with God;" it cannot be abrogated, but only wonderfully heightened and expanded on their entrance into the life beyond, if that entrance finds them fit and capable of such progress.

THE TRUE BASIS OF PRAYER.*

By the Rev. CHARLES H. S. MATTHEWS, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's-in-Thanet.

> "Wilt thou not revive us again, that thy people may rejoice in Thee? Shew us thy mercy, O Lord, and grant us Thy salvation."—Psalm lxxxv. 6 and 7.

Whatever else the sorrows and anxieties of this time of war have or have not accomplished, it is certain that they have made thousands of people long, as never before, for *reality* in prayer and worship.

We can no longer solace our souls with platitudes, or go on glibly repeating prayers which, whatever they have meant in the past, are meaningless to us to-day.

Many in these days have desired, for the first time in their lives, a *real* religion; many have become aware, for the first time in their lives, of the problem of evil. Many, looking out across a tortured world and up at an apparently cold and empty heaven, have questioned whether there is a God at all, or have echoed the cry of the old prophet: "Verily thou art a God that hidest Thyself." Many, out of the anguish of bitter pain and loneliness, have cried, as from the Cross itself: "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

(1) And so it is that when we come to Church, this or that of the old familiar prayers has either seemed to us to have become vain and meaningless words, or, possibly on the other hand, has become charged with new and poignant meaning.

How is it with the Collect for to-day—a collect which for fourteen hundred years or more has had its place among the prayers of the Catholic Church?

> "O Lord raise up (we pray Thee) Thy power and come among us, and with great might succour us, that whereas through our sins and wickedness we are sore let and hindered in running the race that is set before us, Thy bountiful grace and mercy may speedily help and deliver us, through the satisfaction of Thy Son our Lord, to Whom, with Thee and the Holy Ghost be honour and glory, world without end. Amen."

---

*A Sermon preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on the 4th Sunday in Advent, 1916.

It is true, I think, to say that this, like many another of our beautiful Prayer Book Collects, may be on our lips either a vain repetition, or on the other hand a prayer most truly prayed in Christ's Name, and most certain, therefore, to be answered.

Quite plainly the right use of this prayer, as of all prayers, depends in the first instance upon our conception of the character, the purposes, and the methods of the God to whom we pray, and upon the meaning we attach to the particular petitions we offer.

If we allow ourselves to think falsely of God, as though, for instance, He were habitually far away, and only intervened occasionally to set right troubles which had got beyond our own mending. If we think of Him as coming in to save us from the consequences of our own sins and wickedness, without any change of mind on our part. . . . . then, indeed, such a prayer as this will assuredly be vainly repeated.

If we seek by our prayer to change the mind of God, or to alter His will for man—then our prayer is no better than the magic of the heathen.

If we think of God as the God of Battles, on the side perhaps of the big battalions, or as an additional and decisive force on our own side in the war, or as likely to come crashing in at last to give us victory, in answer to our many prayers, then indeed our prayer will be a vain thing.

For whatever men may have thought of God in past ages—and no doubt they have thought of Him, and of His help, in ways like these—we have no warrant for such thoughts of Him in the light of the fuller knowledge of to-day.

It is important for us, if we would pray aright, to remember that prayers once blameless are essentially sinful in the light of fuller knowledge.

> "If I had not come and spoken unto them they had not had sin, but now they have no excuse for their sin."—*St. John* xv. 22.

(2) *It is essential for us to remember that the God who claims our allegiance is the God revealed in Jesus Christ*—a God very different from many of the imaginings of the Old

Testament . . . . very different from Yahweh or Jehovah of Hosts . . . . very different from the legendary God, who was imagined to have sent down fire from Heaven upon the soldiers of King Ahaziah in answer to the prayers of Elijah.

(a) God is Love—that is the inspired summary of the revelation in Jesus Christ of the character of the God we worship, and because He is love we shall never pray aright without love in our hearts, for without love we shall never understand either the purpose or the methods of the God of Love.

> "God," we sing, "is working His purpose out as year succeeds to year."

(b) What is the purpose of the ages . . .? If we know that we shall know for what we ought to pray.

It is summed up for us in the words of St. Paul, in the fourth chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians:—

> "Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error: but speaking the truth in love, may grow up in all things into Him, which is the head, even Christ; from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working, in due measure, of each several part, maketh increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love."

Briefly paraphrased, in modern language, the purpose of God is this—the building up of a community or fellowship of free, creative spirits, governed only by their willing allegiance to the Spirit of Truth which is also the Spirit of Love; Sons of God, living in realization of their Sonship, as brethren one of another. Each several individual contributing his unique and peculiar share to the ordered fabric of a common progressive life.

(c) That is the purpose of God—and our growing insight into the meaning of that purpose is accompanied by an ever deepening sense of the only method by which it can ever be attained—the only method possible to love. In the words of an able writer:—

> "The history of the growth of spirituality in religion is the gradual disappearance of the belief that God exercises power of the external and compulsive kind, and the relization of the omnipotence of divine love to attain its ends without the exercise of compulsion."[1]

In other words, the power of Love is of another order altogether from the power of physical force.

God being what He is, His aim being what it is, He can not—literally *can not*—do many of the things which men even to-day continually ask Him to do. He can not come in to save us in spite of ourselves from the necessary consequences of our steadfast refusal to believe in love or to trust the methods of love.

He can not come in to set the world right by compulsion from without.

All that God can do, when men deliberately place their faith in an imaginary God of Battles or in physical force and the power of compulsion, rather than in Him, is Himself to bear, in agony upon the world's rood, the result of man's blind folly and sin; and by bearing it turn it to good for those who will turn to Him, and see Him—where He is to be found—wherever love is agonizing and enduring.

Steadfastly we have refused through the ages to believe in Truth and Love, in Reason and Goodwill, and upon the basis of this unbelief we have reared our vast civilization—with the quite inevitable result that it is now perishing in the loathsome atmosphere of falsehood, and cunning, and hate, which are the essence of War.

More tragic still—the Church, claiming with loud voice to be the earthly counterpart and instrument of the Kingdom of God—the city set on a hill, the light of the world—has been false to the very ideals she exists to proclaim.

She has chosen to imitate the ideals and policies of the world, claiming temporal power, using secret diplomacy, trusting in external, even physical, force, rather than manifesting the self-denying humility of love. She has feared and

[1] A. C. Turner; *Concerning Prayer* (p. 419).

opposed reason and truth, rather than spoken "the truth in love" . . . until we Churchmen and Churchwomen are indeed "sore let and hindered" by our own cowardice and faithlessness "from running the race that is set before us."

Truly we need to pray to God to raise up His power and come among us--the power of a new outpouring of the Spirit of Love, to open our eyes that we may see Him where He is most plainly revealed wherever love rises triumphant through self-sacrifice over the worst which the forces of the world can do.

We need to be re-created by the Spirit of Love, that we may see a vision of a new and better civilization, a civilization which can only be built upon the ruins of the old by those who, by love, are one with the God of Love.

Vain will be all our hopes, and vain all our prayers, if in the age to come we still pin our faith as in the past, to physical force and the methods of craftiness and the wiles of error, and untruth.

Utterly without power to redeem the world or inspire men with the high ideals entrusted to her keeping will be the Church which refuses to trust in the guidance of the living Spirit of Love; which through the false pride of a mistaken loyalty to the past, hugs those untrue traditions which have already rent her asunder, and trusts either to the methods of worldly diplomacy or to the power of external authority to hold in precarious outward unity those who have lost the true spirit of unity, which is the spirit of loving fellowship.

But, beloved, let us hope and pray for better things than these.

If we really desire to be loving, God will fill our hearts with love.

If we really desire to speak the truth, God will pour upon us the Spirit of Truth.

And so desiring, so bringing forth fruits meet for repentance, we shall assuredly not pray in vain. As George Macdonald says truly of the wondrous coming of old:—

"They all were looking for a King
To slay their foes and lift them high:
Thou cam'st a little baby thing
That made a woman cry."

And so it has ever been, so, because God is what He is, it must ever be.

Not in the might of physical force, or riding on clouds of earthly glory, will He come to-day in answer to our prayer. But come He will, as He came of old, unknown and unnoticed by the loveless world: weak and helpless (as the world estimates strength) yet love incarnate wielding all the power, using all the methods, and claiming all the ministries of love.

So He will, indeed, "raise up His power and come among us and with great might succour us"; not crashing in, indeed, from without," "to slay our foes and lift us high, but suddenly revealed, to loving hearts and truth-seeking minds, worshipped alike by shepherds and by the truly wise, claiming their free homage and calling them to follow Him to the Cross, to be crucified, with Him, by the priests and rulers of the world, by all who fear change, by all who trust in the idol of force and the methods of the unbelieving world, and yet, though crucified with Him, to live in fellowship with Him, and with all His saints, and with Him to spread love abroad in the world and hasten the coming of the Kingdom.

If we believe, indeed, in the Christian God of Love, if we seek the ends of love, if we believe in the methods of love—so that we are willing, if need be, to suffer rejection and crucifixion for love's sake—then we shall not pray to-day's Collect in vain, but, asking we shall have, seeking we shall find, knocking it shall be opened unto us.

Yes, if we have faith enough to trust Him, He will indeed "revive us again," He will "shew us His mercy,"—if that is our *real* prayer—and He will "grant us His Salvation."

CORRESPONDENCE.

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S MANUALS.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

The need for lucid, positive, convincing manuals, dealing with modern religious problems, and making full but not technical use of modern historical and scientific knowledge in its bearing upon the Christian faith and life, is so urgent in the interests of national religion and national morality that I am prepared to subscribe £10 towards the cost of their publication on condition that nineteen other members of the Churchmen's Union will do the same. This offer stands open until February 15th. If £200 were thus realised as a commencement, it would enable the Manuals' Committee, appointed by the Churchmen's Union Council, to start on their labours with some visible means of support, and would thus do something to relieve them from anxiety as to initial ways and means.

Harrogate, 7th January, 1917. P. H. BAGENAL.

THE PRESENT DISCONTENT.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

It is difficult to read unmoved the words quoted in the December number of the *Modern Churchman* which constitute "An Englishman's apologies for his decision to leave the Church." If the course is a mistaken one, it is impossible to doubt that he suffers by his choice. No doubt such a decision is often rashly arrived at, and it is easy, and perhaps natural, for those who are satisfied with the existing conditions to charge the person forming it with impulsiveness or self-conceit. It is, indeed, legitimate to point out that the Church is greater and more lasting than any individual, and that the responsibility of a definite separation is not a light one. But the primary question is not the wisdom or unwisdom of a withdrawal in any given case. What the Church has to consider is her own responsibility in the matter, and whether it be true that such losses are increasing and unavoidable. Those who are disposed to treat the matter most seriously, are particularly liable to be mistaken as to its causes, while, admitting that it deserves consideration as being a possible symptom of a widespread discontent, they are apt to seize upon it as a vindication of their own position, and as a condemnation of their opponents. Party cries against party; each in turn snatching some trifling victory from this wordy controversy, and the magnitude of the issue is obscured in a cloud of irrelevancy. But it is not a matter in which party should be considered. As the peril of the nation has united all lovers of their country for her defence, so the peril of the Church should unite all Churchmen.

Not every man who leaves the Church gives his reasons for so doing; many are incapable of any statement; theirs is a dumb discontent, and attracts no attention. They drop off gradually and unnoticed, perhaps with vague regrets, perhaps all unconsciously, while their silent and unsuspected exit lulls the clergy into a false sense of security. Immersed in controversy, for ever debating points of dogma and discipline, they go their way, while,

day by day, their influence over the minds of men becomes less and less. Far more dangerous than any active hostility is the deadly indifference which threatens the very existence of the Church. A stately ritual and beautiful building fosters an affection akin to that which is inspired by long familiar objects, but they can wake no real enthusiasm, except in the breasts of a very small number of aesthetes. The nation has no more use for a Church without a message than for a Cabinet without a programme. Just now the Bishops are congratulating themselves on the success of the National Mission, they have set a great machinery in motion, and they believe that it has gathered in an ample spiritual harvest. Posters have been set up, leaflets distributed, no means of propaganda has been neglected. If their Lordships would doff their Episcopal attire, and, assuming some convenient disguise, would undertake a series of journies upon the railways of Great Britain, they would meet with rude shocks. Let them get into a third class carriage full of "Tommies" or munition workers, and start the subject of the National Mission, they will find an audience strangely indifferent and culpably ignorant of their great undertakings. Travelling about as they do in a regular uniform which all may recognise, they have no real opportunity of judging the trend of public opinion.

The Bishops ask us to accept Christianity as the cure of all the world's woes, but we cannot fail to remark that this religion of loving kindness seems incapable of uniting the Churches in the face of the greatest crisis in history.

Whatever may be true of political controversy, we know that the religious warfare never slumbers. The pages of the *Church Times* afford a striking witness as to how these Christians love one another.

At two great crises in our History an effort, half-hearted indeed and insincere, was made at comprehension in one united National Church. The ideal was acknowledged, though its attainment was thought to be impossible. To-day the events which call for unity are of far vaster importance than those either of the Restoration or the Revolution, moreover there is the added experience of two hundred years to go upon. Will the opportunity be allowed once more to pass? We may well ask if the Apostolic succession is of greater moment than the unity of Christendom, and ritual differences than the principles of Christianity. It is a proof that would go far to convince the nation, and to win converts, if the Churches laying aside their bitterness, were to declare their readiness to allow an ample latitude in all matters of outward observance for the attainment of this great object.

If the Christian forces of this country were again united they might succeed in quickening the interest of all in spiritual matters, and in causing a return to that healthy condition of affairs when everything that concerned the Church was of vital interest to the nation. It must be admitted that the mutually exclusive attitude of the religious castes already existing within the establishment hardly warrant the hope that a conference with unity as its end would prove fruitful. Christianity has become such a very complicated thing, that it requires much study to learn the reasons why one Christian may not share in the worship of another. But the world outside has not the time to spare, and only judges of the spirit pervading the Churches by the results. The Church of England herself is split up into sections, it is

impossible for the honest enquirer to form any idea of what she stands for, the ascendancy of any one is not so great as to give its colour to the whole. Bishop Gore gives one answer to the question, but his interpretation is at once indignantly and weightily denied by the Dean of Durham. Meanwhile, the ordinary man only sees the outward effects of all this controversy, and it is most unlikely that he will busy himself with the views of the Bishop of Oxford or Dr. Henson. Like a State supplied with an unreliable secret service, she taps the wrong sources of information, and has got into the way of relying upon the ecclesiastically-minded layman, who for such a purpose is entirely useless, as her connecting link with the outside world. If we consider the policy of the Church during the last few decades we shall hardly wonder at her present condition, or at the confusion which prevails. The brains of the greatest scholars in Europe have been ceaselessly devoted to a detailed examination of the Scriptures, and of early Christian origins, and they have disclosed the results of their labours in numberless publications. Meanwhile, the Church has stood serenely by, admitting the truth of most of their conclusions, but determined to take no action. Her articles, and creeds, and services remain the same; in nothing will she give ground, though it seems to us that the ground is shifting under her feet.

She has refused to assimilate this vast store of learning, and to act in accordance with its impost. *Tranquilla non movere* has been her motto, and she has shrunk from the far-reaching changes which an effort to grapple with the question must involve. The inevitable has happened: it was, and is, concluded that she dare not speak; all her tardy explanations and halting interpretations are taken as being mere subterfuges. It is perhaps important to remember that it is general impressions and not concrete utterances which affect public opinion in this matter. Relatively, few ever read a theological work, but a garbled version of what it contains gets abroad, and the mischief is done. It is felt that the Church is in a constant state of irritation with her best minds, making efforts to restrain them when they refuse to be restrained, and thereby confessing the weakness of her position. Not what the Biblical scholar really wrote, but what the ordinary man, who does not read him, thinks that he wrote, is the really important thing. We cannot hide from ourselves that at bottom the Church is faced with the difficulty of a re-statement which may vitally affect the religion she proclaims. She must surely face this supremely important issue, and make up her mind upon the possibility of having to replace, if not to rescind, many of her dogmatic formulae.

Such action would be much less dangerous than her present silence and inaction. As the late Bishop Paget once wrote: "To do nothing, when we ought to be doing something, is the height of rashness. Before the Church authorities make their final arrangements to receive the flood of khaki-clad humanity, which we are told is coming back to them, let them prepare to answer in a simple, straightforward, modern fashion the questions upon the foundations of the faith, which no doubt will be propounded by those who have turned from arms to the pursuit of theology.

The Church has lost a golden opportunity by forbidding active service, except as chaplains, to her ministers; such action confirms the feeling that

there can be no close understanding between the man in orders and "the other man" whose whole outlook on life is so fundamentally different. A soldier's reasoning upon the matter is not over-subtle, he thinks that active participation in the war must either be right, in which case the clergy should be engaged, or wrong, in which case they have no right to tell him to go and do the job for them. The dilemma may well appear insurmountable.

But of all sad lots that of the thinking man, who turns for an explanation of the cruel problem of life to the Churches, is surely the saddest. The war has intensified every difficulty an hundredfold, which the answers offered seem more than ever inadequate. We are forced to recognise the terribly vicarious nature of punishment, the giant waste, the ever-present pain, which pervade the universe, and they talk to us of an omnipotent and beneficent God who had ordained it all, and not content with this grand total of misery crowned it by demanding the sacrifice of His blameless Son as the only condition of forgiveness. Fortunately there are hundreds of clergy who would disown such a statement of their position, but while it remains the orthodox interpretation they are exposed to the charge of dishonesty and unfaithfulness. Yet if this outworn interpretation, repeated at every Communion Service, clashes so violently with our most elementary ideas of justice, we must make good the deficiency by the construction of a faith on our own account and abandon a Church which teaches one that is outworn. There are indeed abundant evidences that educated men are learning to rely upon themselves in these matters rather than to have recourse to the outworn theology of another age.

There is still a great opportunity for the Church to meet their needs, for she is possessed of a faith which in its essential part can never be outgrown. Shall the Christian religion which has sanctified suffering and sacrifice part at the very time when suffering and sacrifice are most widely displayed? The events of these last three years have not re-established the outworn and untrue dogmas which have obscured the Gospel of Christ Himself, and the man who thinks our soldiers have been driven to re-embrace them must be very ignorant or very credulous. There are three possible developments, the nation must find a new religion; or it must abandon all faith and hope and drift rudderless; or the old and precious faith must be once more fitted to furnish the moral strength and spiritual consolation that to our countrymen which they so greatly need.

The tremendous responsibility of this decision rests with the Church authorities. But dare they simplify and re-state their dogmatic teaching in the light of modern knowledge? The English Church authorities of the sixteenth century did, will not those of the twentieth century do their duty also?

A Layman.

CHURCH AND STATE AND THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMITTEE.

A Caveat.

Sir, *To the Editor of* The Modern Churchman.

I have read carefully the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State, and your article in the August issue of the *Modern*

Churchman. Your article, though containing some sound criticism of certain proposals contained in the Report, seems to me to adopt a tone of eulogy against which I desire to enter a caveat.

No thoughtful and earnest well-wisher of the Church of England will desire to give other than a patient and respectful consideration to a document signed by the eminent Churchmen whose names appear at the end of the Report. But it must be said at once that those names include some whose concurrence in the Report will necessitate not only a patient and respectful but a vigilant consideration of the recommendations of the Committee, on the part of those, at least, to whom non-sacerdotal Christianity is as the very breath of life.

It seems also important to remember that the Report is put forth as the case for the Church. The case for the State remains to be put, and until it has been put the nation will, no doubt, desire to suspend judgment in relation to the charges which are brought against the State and Parliament.

It is stated (page 3) that the State "asks much of the National Church," and these words are doubtless intended to imply that the State gets what it asks. Many people will think that there are serious grounds for questioning the truth of these implications, and the point is one which may well be made the subject of legitimate and searching investigation on the part of the State.

The claims which are made on behalf of the Church are of such a far-reaching character that I venture to say that those who dread nothing so much as the domination of ecclesiastics and their lay satellites will not accept, without putting to the strictest test, the statement (page 55) that "whatever other fault may be found with our plan it cannot reasonably be denounced as handing over the laity to clerical dominance."

The Memoranda of the Bishop of Oxford (page 243) and Dr. Frere (page 265) contain statements which I suggest are of sinister significance for Liberal Churchmen. The former claims for the Church "liberty to exercise discipline over its members, determining *e.g.*, questions of orthodoxy in courts of its own, and determining also who is to be admitted to the sacraments. The latter appears to contemplate the possibility of the Church exercising over its members a coercive discipline with powers borrowed from the State. These points may be mentioned as straws showing which way the wind is blowing In the minds of some members of the Committee.

The Bishop of Oxford also looks forward to "the reconstitution of the . . . judicial system of our own Church." and Dr. Frere speaks of "a reformed system of ecclesiastical courts, such as must be inaugurated in due course." Here, no doubt, we have foreshadowed the Anglo-Catholic attack on that august Court, perhaps, in point of jurisdiction, competence, and status, the greatest Law Court of the world, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in its capacity of Final Court of Appeal in ecclesiastical causes. Do Liberal Churchmen desire that the Crown should be advised in ecclesiastical appeals by some new Court, constituted so as to please Anglo-Catholics, rather than by the present Court, sitting with Episcopal Assessors?

You say in your article that "the most attractive part of the proposed cheme is the establishment in every Parish of Parochial Church Councils

with legal powers." Agreed, provided the legal powers are real and effective. But to what do the suggested legal powers amount? Is there one which will enable a Parochial Council to make effective the wishes of the parishioners as against those of the incumbent and Bishop? The Council is to be empowered to make representations to the Bishop with regard to certain very important matters. But surely there is nothing to prevent a voluntary Church Council, which has no legal powers, making such representations now. And what has experience shown a representation to a Bishop to be worth? If some effective weapon, such as the power of the purse, were given to the Council, the Council's representations to the Bishop might be made on more equal terms.

It will not, I think, escape notice that there is one great, and possibly fatal, omission from the report. In spite of the cataclysm of the war, the national unity which it has produced, the fundamental changes of opinion which it has induced, and the knowledge that vast processes of reconstruction in our national and imperial life must follow the war, the Committee appear to assume that the State will continue to recognise religion in and through the Anglican Church without reference to the multitudes of non-episcopalian Christians, who are included in the nation; for no attempt is made to suggest any consideration of questions of comprehension, such as exercised the minds of great and devout Churchmen of the 17th century, with a view to making the Church National in fact, where now it is only so in name.

Speaking generally, I venture to think that Liberal Churchmen will find much in this Report which they will feel compelled to challenge, and though no Liberal Churchman will deny the real importance of the questions of constitutional machinery with which the Report deals, I suggest that a perusal of the Report will do nothing to impair the conviction that what is primarily wanted in the Church of England to-day is not so much a revolution in machinery as a revolution in ideas.

H. F. WALKER.

21, *Blenheim Road,*
St. Albans.

THE TRAINING OF ORDINANDS.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

A great change is passing over the face of contemporary thought. Whatever the future have in store for us, one thing seems certain, we shall never return to the condition of things that ruled previous to August, 1914. The social sphere, the commercial sphere, the political sphere, will (as everybody now admits) be profoundly modified by the events of the last two years. Progress is sometimes slow and difficult; at times it is rapid and easy; and those two years have witnessed a progress in human affairs that has been incredibly rapid. What might ordinarily take a whole century to accomplish, has been done in a brief space of time. The experience of generations has been concentrated into that amazing interval.

Religion (we hope—nay, we believe) will not be exempt from the encircling influences of the time. When I say Religion, I am not thinking

of Christianity only, for all the religions of mankind are bound to be modified. But it is Christianity that touches us most closely; and it is of this form of universal religion that I would speak. And the question one puts to oneself is this: What will be the precise effect on Christianity exerted by this war, with all its infinite lessons and experiences? It would be rash to dogmatize; but it seems safe to say that Christianity will emerge re-shaped, and (we trust) renewed and revivified. The people, touched to fine issues by the finger of sorrow, will welcome any sincere effort to render the Faith of our Fathers a more energizing and fruitful influence in their lives, and, at first, they will turn to see what their accredited teachers, the clergy, can effect. If these teachers prove reeds of Egypt, the people will turn to unaccredited teachers; but, at any rate, they will demand—and justly demand—that fresh light be shed on world-old problems.

In the main, they will turn vainly to ancient depositories of spiritual wisdom. Vainly—for those who have all their lives read *Mumpsimus* are not going to read *Sumpsimus* now. This is natural, perhaps inevitable. The future of Christianity lies, then, not with the old but the new teachers. How important, therefore, that the new spiritual directors should be perfectly equipped for their tremendous responsibilities! To that end they will need to be *taught*. The pabulum of the theological college will need to be changed. At present, candidates for the ministry—in view of their ordination examinations—receive but a slender training to cope with the problems of religious life and faith. How futile are these examinations in most cases! The subjects chosen, with dull iteration, year after year, are (in a great degree) useless. And it is by these examinations that the mentality of our younger clergy are largely moulded. A little Church History, a little Greek Testament, a little Prayer Book study, the reading of such books as *Rufinus on the Creed*, a course of (often quite inadequate) study on the Old Testament; what lasting good can come of all this? Our ordination candidates might do vastly better if called upon to study such books, for example, as Bernard Shaw's *Androcles and the Lion*, with its irritating but usefully provocative Preface on Christianity; or they might be required to become acquainted with McTaggart's *Some Dogmas of Religion;* or Mr. J. M. Robertson's *Short History of Christianity;* or (to mention an older work) Cotter Morison's *The Service of Man.* A careful course of English literature might not be amiss; it would (perchance) teach them to write their sermons in good nervous English, and to clothe their thoughts in adequate language.

At present, Episcopal Ordination Examinations are inadequate, to say the least; and probably the results are without value in hundreds of cases. A *learned* clergyman (in the old-fashioned sense of the term) is not necessary; but a highly trained clergy is essential, if the people are to be taught on right lines.

We train our chemists and our physicists before they begin their careers, and long and painful is that training; is it not time—high time—that we trained our clergy? They must become familiar with the problems that vex and disturb thinking people; otherwise how can they deal properly with those problems?

Old habits of thought are passing away in the crucible of war. New habits of thought are necessary, if we are to confront modern questions in their vastness and complexity. At present, the Bishops fiddle about with trivial matters of liturgy and ritual, that never "come home to men's business and bosoms;" a real "lead" they never seem capable of giving us. Most of them are opportunists; opportunism is the badge of their tribe. But unless they wake up to the vital significance of latter-day happenings, the Church they are supposed to lead and rule will suffer beyond the power of redemption.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

[For the past five years we have urged reform in this matter.—ED. *M.C.*]

LAITY ON CHURCH COUNCILS.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

There were, doubtless, many disquieting symptoms of defects in the nation when the war broke out, but the fact that the country possessed a healthy and numerous "Saving Remnant" in her midst soon became evident, and proved that, after all, the heart and the roots of the old tree were still sound.

The men of the new armies and the old have shewn quite unconsciously that a spirit well worthy of the term Christian was alive in them. Their readiness to serve in a great cause, the way in which they have borne themselves under the unimagined horrors of civilized warfare, point convincingly to that conclusion. Yet, if we bear in mind the statistics relating to the attendance of men at services in parish churches, we must infer that a majority of those soldiers had been accustomed to take little or no part in the ministrations of the Church.

Now, if the above inference be correct, it brings home very forcibly, and with a touch of irony, our failure in the matter of public worship. The feebleness of the influence of the Church on the national life in other directions has been dwelt upon frequently of late in the pamphlets and addresses called forth by the Mission now in progress.

The present time affords a great opportunity for taking in hand certain urgent reforms. But we must not ask for too many at first. Upon one movement, however, we might concentrate our effort, namely that of bringing these laity in large numbers into the councils of the Church.

Can we of the Churchmen's Union throw out any suggestions towards a workable plan for throwing open doors for their admission? They would include representatives of labour, trades, professions, railways, and the other Government services; of the clerks, schoolmasters, artists, actors, journalists; of those who do not frequently attend church services, as well as of those who do; of all who wish to see the Church become a strong, moral, and religious force in the national life.

Our Church has doubtless many needs to be supplied if she is to become actually the Church of the Nation. The first step towards securing that the most pressing of these shall be faced in the near future, seems to be to get a

full tide of new life and fresh blood into her various councils. It would not be long before more real powers than they at present possess would be secured for the lay members of councils, chapters, and conferences.

Constable Road, Ipswich. J. A. C. V. DECANDOLE.

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP GROUPS.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMEN.

May I supplement Mr. Moxon's letter in your last number by a short account of one or two steps which have been taken in this city in the direction of closer fellowship between the various Christian bodies?

For some years past, quite a small group of us—ministers of several denominations with one or two laymen—have met at each other's houses for the discussion of matters which concern us all. These meetings have been entirely informal. We meet, so far as possible, every month. Someone introduces a subject agreed upon at the previous meeting, and discussion is quite free and friendly. I think, from this experience, that the frequent meeting of small groups of people who get to know each other well, and feel able in such company to speak what is in their minds without reserve, is probably of more value than a large and more formal conference.

At the beginning of 1916, the Bishop of Bristol and the Chairman of the Bristol Free Church Council summoned a meeting in one of the largest halls of the city for united prayer for the nation. There was very little speaking; the business of the meeting was intercession.

The large hall was filled to its utmost capacity, and numbers overflowed into a smaller hall in the same building. I believe that both Churchpeople and Nonconformists felt that it was good for them to be there.

To these I must add the very friendly invitation recently extended by the President of the Free Church Council to the Chairman of the Bristol Branch of the Churchmen's Union to address his congregation on a recent Sunday evening; and the equally friendly response of the two Bishops concerned.

Bristol, 30th Dec., 1916. J. M. JEAKES.

TASK OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY REFORMERS.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

I am inclined to believe that your correspondent Dr. Dawes is a humorist, and is therefore anxious to enliven the *Modern Churchman* by baiting a Modernist, or by drawing some unwary Catholic into the "turbid stream of controversy." As a Catholic and Liberal (Dr. Dawes, if he writes seriously, would probably call me a Romanizer), who, for the very reason that I am a Catholic, and still more because of my Liberalism, is bent upon the support and active propagation of all that Dr. Dawes would destroy, who, moreover, have been for several years a member of the Churchmen's Union, I write to protest against the inclusion of such frivolity in your pages of correspondence. Catholic Clergy have often said to me that the Churchmen's Union was a purely Protestant body, and not in the

least bit Liberal. That the *Modern Churchman* was as intolerant in its attitude to the practice of Catholicism, as the *Church Times* is to the practice of Protestantism, or the effects of Liberalism. At times it has been extremely difficult to answer them, and the inclusion of this kind of letter would seem to more than justify the inferences which they have drawn in the past.

It is, of course, sufficiently clear that Dr. Dawes is no Liberal, but simply a determined protagonist of Protestant Iconoclasm. I have no quarrel with him. My complaint, Sir, is with you, or rather with your decision to include Dr. Dawes' letter amongst your correspondence. For its intolerance cannot fail to do harm to the cause of Liberalism for which the *Modern Churchman* stands. That it in no way represents the views of the Churchmen's Union, I am well assured, but it cannot pass unchallenged, since it will give our opponents an opportunity to say: "There, I told you so, the Churchmen's Union stands for the policy of the Church Association; you might as well read the *English Churchman* as the *Modern Churchman*, their objective is the same."

I think also, Sir, you should have remembered that the Churchmen's Union contains some to whom all these practices are very dear, whose outlook and temperament is Catholic, not Protestant; to them such a letter will bring pain, unless they are able to see the unconscious, or conscious, humour of your correspondent.

Singleton House, Monmouth,
Dec. 22nd, 1916.

E. O. IREDELL.

[Editors are not responsible for the views of their correspondents, and providing letters are brief, lucid, and of interest, they ought to be printed if space permit. Dr. Dawes' letter fulfilled all these conditions admirably.

A long correspondence following on a recent article in our pages has shewn two things very clearly, (1) that the Churchmen's Union, and the very much wider circle of readers of the *Modern Churchman*, comprise two classes of Modern Churchmen, viz., Liberal Protestants and Modernist Catholics, and (2) that it is most needful that both of these types of Churchmen should learn to understand, tolerate, and trust each other. And that, as the result of this co-education and mutual confidence, they should learn to co-operate in advancing those ideals of truth, freedom, and love, for which they believe they stand, within the Christian Church.

Had Mr. Iredell written briefly, shewing the limitations and difficulties of Dr. Dawes' *agenda*, we believe he would have helped forward our purpose; better still, had he written setting forth negatively and positively the Modernist Catholic's *agenda*, he would have helped our cause even more.

If our cause is to achieve its end, it must unite both types of Liberals; but that cannot be done by refusing either party, however extreme, a hearing, or by declining to reason with them on the ground that they are humorists or fanatics.—ED. *M.C.*].